

# **Board Study Session & Business Meeting (Tuesday, October 8, 2013)**

*Generated by Shelley R Shelton on Wednesday, October 9, 2013*

## **Members present**

Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## **Staff Members present**

Keith C. Rittel, Superintendent; Ray Morgan, Assistant Superintendent; Kerry Smith, Business Administrator; Gary Wilson, Exec. Director Student Services; Gaye Gibbs, Exec. Director Elementary Education; Shelley Shelton, Exec. Assistant

Excused: Melissa Frost, Exec. Director Human Services

## **Guests**

Christy Giblon and Kathy Giles, PEA; Charity Williams, After School Programs; Missy Hamilton, Spring Creek Principal; Jennifer Partridge, Marty Evans and other members of the Facilities Advisory Committee; Morgan Anderson, Special Programs Director; Mark Wheeler, Facilities Director; Caleb Price, Communications & Public Relations; Chad Duncan, Technology Director

## **Meeting called to order at 5:03 PM**

# **1. 5:00 - 7:00 p.m. Study Session**

---

A. Welcome: President Michelle Kaufusi

B. Roll Call

C. Policies

Student Services Executive Director Gary Wilson led the discussion regarding the draft policies presented for board approval. Most policies being presented are required by the State for the LEA Assurances.

Policy 3610 Religious Instruction Release Time - allows for one period per day to be allotted for religious instruction, including during a four-period day.

In response to board member feedback, the following modifications will be made to the procedures document:

- Add a statement reiterating the requirement of mandatory school attendance if students are not attending seminary.
- The statement, "Students will be granted released time for religious instruction only upon the written request of their parents or legal guardian" will be reworded to clarify the parent form submission process and to indicate the district will work with the policies of the Church Education System to track attendance.

The arrival of Member Checketts was noted at 5:10 p.m.

Policy 3450 Social Workers - lays out the requirements for social worker qualifications.

Policy 3410 Services to Homebound Students - allows students to stay connected to school during long periods of absence. It does not attempt to make an exact correlation to what is happening in the classroom. Allows homework to be given and student / teacher interaction to take place.

Policy 3160 Non-Utah Resident Students - if a student from out of state is attending school in Provo, parents are required to pay tuition (approximately \$6,000 per year). Relinquished guardianship to an in-state guardian through the court system allows a student to be a legal resident, and no tuition is required.

## D. Bond Planning

President Michelle Kaufusi and Vice President Julie Rash opened the discussion. Notes from the September 27 retreat discussion were distributed to board members. Talking points included:

- \$90 Million vs. Some Other Amount
  - The Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC) recommended that we work within this range, and there is safety in staying within the FAC recommended amount.
  - The FAC discussed the pros and cons of exceeding \$100 million and felt it was too high; we will be seen as extreme if we exceed the FAC recommended range.
  - The \$90 million can be a plus / minus amount: \$89 million? \$92.5 million? This is consistent with the parameters of the FAC recommendation.
  - Board members have expressed concern about the bond amount. Some feel more comfortable with an amount lower than \$90 million. Others feel we should ask in excess of \$120 million. Compromises may need to occur on both ends to align with the FAC recommended amount.
- Rebuilding Dixon vs. Provo High
  - There is concern regarding east-side support of a PHS-dominated bond: rebuilding Rock Canyon at \$14 million and Provo High at \$67 million would amount to \$81 million. The next least expensive elementary school to rebuild, Edgemont, could possibly be done at \$13.3 million, but would raise the bond amount to \$94.5 million. Would this generate enough support - especially on the east side - for the bond to pass?
  - \$18.3 million annually in repairs and maintenance of PHS is necessary to keep the school operational in the event it is not rebuilt with the current bond.
  - Including PHS on this bond commits the district to the current location for the next 50+ years. It removes any option of discussing a change in location in the next bond, even though the district and board are aware of projected population changes and shifts in the next 10-20 years. Are we being responsible toward the next 50+ years to make that decision now?
- Dixon Location
  - Why would we spend an additional \$4-6.5 million on acquiring additional property for Dixon when we already own property where it could be rebuilt? That money could go to other projects (Wasatch, additional help for PHS, etc.)
  - If Dixon is rebuilt on its current location the district MUST acquire more property. This would be costly (paying premium prices, assuming the owners actually want to sell, etc.) It would upset the community if we exercise "eminent domain"; how many voters would vote NO because we took people's homes?
  - More time would allow for more information from the city regarding redevelopment and growth.
  - District administration could research other possible locations in the south end of the city. It is unknown how long it would take to gather this information.
- Long-Term Thinking
  - Concerns exist about how much the next bond may cost. What has not been recognized is that the more we provide quality schools that are on time, on budget, etc., on this bond, the more the community would be inclined to support bonds in the future. The current bond must meet real needs in a substantial, fair way.
- Balance Between East and West
  - Dixon and Sunset View would represent a commitment of around \$45 million to the west side of Provo.
  - Edgemont, Rock Canyon and Provost would represent a commitment of around \$45 million to the east side of the district.
- Questions that must be resolved:
  - Is the board ready to take the vote tonight on moving forward with a defined bond plan including projects and amount?
  - Is the board ready to take a unanimous vote?
  - Is the board ready to promote the bond in a genuine spirit of compromise and unity?

Board member feedback:

- Member Staples
  - Bond "passability" is the first concern; if the bond doesn't pass, nothing else matters.
  - Recommended the board not exceed the FAC recommended amount.
  - Dixon vs. PHS needs more discussion, including a possible new Dixon location.

- The bond must be cast in a positive light within the community.
- Member Poulsen
  - The climate is such that parents are interested in the safety and welfare of their children.
  - Many buildings were built in the post-war era, have been repaired in a piecemeal approach, and are lacking the necessary technology infrastructure.
  - Board members need to commit to the same amount of research the FAC engaged in to gather data.
  - Rebuilding Dixon benefits the whole west side of the City (as far as who attends).
  - The proposed rebuilding projects are evenly split between the east and west sides of the city.
  - The location of certain schools needs to be discussed.
  - There could be other ways to utilize property during a school rebuild.
  - Do boundaries, school population size, bussing, school choice, and dual immersion need to be discussed prior to making a decision?
    - Supt. Rittel suggested the board make the decision on the bond amount, then deal with the above issues.
- Member Judkins
  - The board all agrees that the seven schools need to be rebuilt. The difficulty lies in which schools to include in the bond and the overall bond amount.
  - We have no data on the amount the voters might approve. We need more data for an informed decision.
  - Dixon: where would it be rebuilt?
    - Grandview location:
      - All secondary schools would be north of 900 North.
      - Access to the school could be difficult, according to the fire marshal (second-hand information). It would be difficult to add more entrances to the property because of the way it sits on the hill.
      - Dixon has a vital adult education ESL program
        - 200-275 students each term; many walk or get a ride
        - Moving the school further north would make it difficult for those adult students to attend
    - Current Dixon Site:
      - The cost would be about \$7 million, but it would lift the neighborhood and retain better access for patrons
      - Is there land on the south side of the district that could be utilized?
  - What is the best fiscal plan?
    - The FAC compared the repair / maintenance cost percentage with the amount needed to rebuild each school:
      1. Rock Canyon: 37% (the r/m costs would be 37% of what it would cost to rebuild the school)
      2. PHS: 27%
      3. Dixon: 16%
      4. Edgemont: 16%
      5. Provost: 14%
      6. Wasatch: 11%
      7. Sunset View: 10%
- Rebuilding PHS:
  - To rebuild Provo High would conservatively save %18.3 million in repair and maintenance costs. Those savings would build 1.5 elementary schools, or nearly 2/3 of Dixon.
  - Students are at PHS for four years, compared to two years at Dixon.
  - PHS is a Provo landmark in the center of the city.
  - People from all over the city are PHS graduates.
  - We need to think of the long-term plan. To implement the plan agreed upon during the retreat, the board would need to ask for an additional \$80 million in the next bond.
  - If we bonded for \$95 million now, PHS and three elementary schools could be rebuilt, leaving Dixon and two elementary schools for the next bond of approximately \$60 million.
- Plan for a city-wide patron survey
  - Explain the urgency
  - Explain \$155-200 million is needed to address all impacted schools

- Explain that the board's bonding authority is \$125 million, making it impossible to address all current needs
  - We cannot do all that is needed right now, but we can do a lot with the voters' help
  - School rebuild priorities have been ranked according to the data including both fiscal and architectural needs.
  - Member Judkins's proposed ranking:
    1. Rock Canyon
    2. Provo High
    3. Sunset View
    4. Edgemont
    5. Provost
    6. Wasatch
    7. Dixon
  - Survey respondents would indicate where they would draw the line for the amount of the bond.
  - With a \$95 million bond, Rock Canyon, PHS, Sunset View and Edgemont could be rebuilt.
  - With a \$125 million bond, Rock Canyon, Sunset View, PHS, Provost, Edgemont and Wasatch could be rebuilt.
- Member Pettersson
    - We can't bond beyond \$90 million; the economy, future city bonding and fee increases all need to be balanced.
    - Growth projections in the city could impact the future location of PHS.
    - We must be sensitive to the resulting economic impact to patrons in the district, particularly those on fixed incomes.
    - Dixon is a priority over Provo High.
    - The proposed east / west allocations are a good balance.
  - Member Checketts
    - Agreed with Members Pettersson's points
    - Supports a bond of \$90 million or less
    - Supports the proposed school building priority list as defined during the Sept. 27 board retreat

Business Administrator Kerry Smith shared the following item for consideration:

- In regards to Member Judkins's statement that bonding for \$95 million would allow the rebuilding of Provo High and three elementary schools, he indicated that while he had not had a chance to verify the numbers reported by Member Judkins, Mr. Smith agreed that rebuilding a school eliminates the repair and maintenance budget for that school and the savings could be applied to an additional school. He reiterated that the data shows the top seven schools on the FAC list need to be replaced.

Facilities Director Mark Wheeler added that it's difficult to say we'll cut \$18M in repairs and maintenance at PHS; it's one of the largest facilities. Repair and maintenance on a new facility would be \$4-6 million over ten years. The schools on the list were top on the architect's and structural engineer's lists of schools in need of seismic upgrades.

Following further discussion it was determined the motion would be worded to state the bond was not to exceed \$90 million; a list of schools to be rebuilt would be included in the motion, and that further study and public information sessions would take place.

Superintendent Keith Rittel and Business Administrator Kerry Smith will work on a two-bond cycle strategy for board review.

## E. Proposed Budget Committee Members (5 min.)

Business Administrator Kerry Smith reviewed the background of the budget committee formation:

- In the September board business meeting, the board established an ongoing budget committee as part of a long term review and perspective and to influence the establishment of annual goals. The membership was established as having board membership, the superintendent, the business administrator, the financial analyst, and community members as appointed by the board.
- Administration would like to recommend Jack May, Vice President of Zions First National Bank as a

community member of the standing budget committee. Jack May has served as a Provo City School District Foundation board member and has access to Zions extensive economic forecasting resources.

- Administration would also like to recommend a financial analyst with Central Utah Clinic, living within Provo City, to serve on the standing budget committee. As medical inflation and the Affordable Care Act are of major concern, we feel it extremely beneficial to have an expert in the medical field on the standing budget committee. We recommend avoiding a possible conflict of interest by not using an IHC representative as IHC and Select Health are our medical and insurance providers respectively. Scott Barlow, CEO of Central Utah Clinic, will be recommending an analyst who lives within Provo City.
- Administration asked the board to name at least one board member to serve on the standing Budget committee. It is envisioned the budget committee would have its first meeting in October.
  - Board Member Checketts nominated Member Poulsen as a member of the budget committee. Member Poulsen agreed to serve.

## F. PHS Athletic Field Naming Rights (20 min.)

Member Checketts reviewed the background of the request to name the PHS athletic field. It was suggested a committee be formed to consider the naming rights request and make recommendations to the board. An issue could be whether or not naming should only be done posthumously.

The topic will be added to the Oct. 22 study session.

## G. Consent Calendar Review & Questions

## I. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the study session.

Motion by Marsha Judkins, second by Steven Staples.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## **2. 7:00 p.m. Business Meeting**

---

A. Welcome: President Michelle Kaufusi

C. Opening Remarks: Vice President Julie Rash

D. Pledge of Allegiance: Niko Ventura, Spring Creek 6th Grade Student

## **3. Community Connections**

---

A. School Report: Spring Creek Elementary

Principal Missy Hamilton shared her presentation with the board. Talking points included (see attached):

- Enrollment

- Ethnicity
- Limited English Proficiency
- Mobility
- Students with Disabilities
- Socio Economic Status
- School Mission Statement
- Student Achievement Data Trend in Math, Reading and Science
- Points of Pride
- Challenges
- Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement
- Student Success and Achievement
- Instructional Programming
- Instructional Strategies

## B. Public Input

Christy Giblon, 1808 W 1000 S Springville, addressed the board regarding the recent recognition of Leann Moody, Dixon English teacher.

# 4. Business Items

---

## A. Acceptance of the Financial Audit Report (CAFR), Acceptance of the Budget Report, Acceptance of the Financial and Budget Awards, and Recognition of the Business Staff

Business Administrator Kerry Smith reviewed the goals of the business office to receive the GFOA and UASBO awards each year. Accounting Director Stefanie Bryant and Christine Miller, Financial Analyst presented the awards for the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report to the Board.

Ms. Bryant highlighted the Independent Auditor's Report and noted components of the Management's Discussion and Analysis

Financial Analyst Christine Miller reviewed the components of the Budget Book and presented the awards to the board.

Business Administrator Kerry Smith shared background information on each person in the business office.

I move the board accept the 2013-2014 budget report, accept the 2012-2013 CAFR, accept the 2011-2012 ASBO and GFOA financial awards, accept the 2012-2013 ASBO and GFOA budget awards, and express gratitude to the business office for their contributions in this area.

Motion by Marsha Judkins, second by Shannon Poulsen.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## B. Approve Policy 3610 Religious Instruction Release Time

I recommend that we approve Policy 3610 Religious Instruction Release Time.

Motion by Steven Staples, second by Julie Rash.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## C. Approve Policy 3450 Social Workers

I recommend that we approve Policy 3450 Social Workers.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Marsha Judkins.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## D. Approve Policy 3410 Services to Homebound Students

I recommend that we approve Policy 3410 Services to Homebound Students.

Motion by Marsha Judkins, second by Steven Staples.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## E. Approve Policy 3160 Non-Utah Resident Students

I recommend that we approve Policy 3160 Non-Utah Resident Students.

Motion by Shannon Poulsen, second by Julie Rash.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## F. Approve Bond Priorities

I move that we proceed with a public information plan for a school construction bond initiative not to exceed \$90 million including further studies and public information sessions with the purpose of rebuilding Rock Canyon Elementary, Dixon Middle School, Provost Elementary, Edgemont Elementary and Sunset View Elementary.

Motion by Vance Checketts, second by Jim Pettersson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

# 5. Consent Calendar

---

## A. Board Minutes as Part of the Consent Calendar

Resolution: I move we approve the board minutes as posted.

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## B. Sept. 10 Study Session & Business Meeting

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## C. Sept. 27 Board Retreat

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## D. Personnel Report as Part of the Consent Calendar

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## E. Home School/School Choice/eSchool Report as Part of the Consent Calendar

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## F. Financial Reports as Part of the Consent Calendar

I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples



## G. Approve the Consent Calendar

Resolution: I move we approve the consent calendar.

Motion by Jim Pettersson, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

## **6. Board Member Reports**

---

## **7. Superintendent's Report**

---

A. Approved Student Travel

B. National Principals Month

C. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the business meeting.

Motion by Steven Staples, second by Vance Checketts.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: Michelle Kaufusi, Julie Rash, Vance Checketts, Marsha Judkins, Jim Pettersson, Shannon Poulsen, Steven Staples

The business meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.